

R E M A R K S

Claims 1-8 currently remain in the application. Claims 7 and 8 are new claims and claims 1, 5 and 6 are herein amended.

In said Final Office Action dated April 30, 2008, the Examiner rejected claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by Kodosky and claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by Sodooji. At least in part in response to the Examiner's reasons for the rejection, independent claims 1, 5 and 6 are herein amended extensively, mainly by explaining what the terms "function block definition" and "function block instance" mean and how they are related, and at least that they are different concepts.

With claims 1, 5 and 6 thus amended by introducing further limitations, it is believed that amended claims 1, 5 and 6 obviate the Examiner's rejection and will now be found allowable because Kodosky, for example, discloses only one kind of hierarchical structure. The display of hierarchical structure disclosed by Kodosky may at most be considered similar to the hierarchical structure of function block instances of the present invention. The Examiner is requested to note in Figs. 20A and 20B of Kodosky where the menu shows only an item called "Find all instances". By contrast, two kinds of hierarchical structures are considered and these two hierarchical structures (of two different kinds as now made clear by the instant amendment) are displayed on the same screen according to the present invention. Devices, methods or recording media having such feature are believed to be new and have never been available or considered.

New dependent claims 7 and 8 are being introduced, further explaining the block definition analyzer and the block instance analyzer, as well as their functions, more in detail. These claims are being introduced at least in part in order to make it still clearer that the present invention is distinguishable from what Fig. 17 of Kodosky, for example, may be interpreted as disclosing. Kodosky's Fig. 17 shows a hierarchical structure with programs icon 402, etc. depending (hanging) from device icon 412. In other words, Kodosky does show graphical representation with a plurality of program icons connected by lines, showing a kind of dependence relationship among the program icons. However, Kodosky does not disclose how such dependence relationship is extracted. Claims 7 and 8 are intended to limit the invention in terms of the method by which structural relationships are extracted for two different kinds

"function block definitions" and "function block instances". Explained more in detail, the present invention is believed further distinguishable in that two distinct kinds of hierarchical structure are extracted and displayed by analyzing a same program.

In summary, amended claims 1, 5 and 6 are believed to be allowable in view of the cited references because the difference between function block definitions and function block instances has now been made clear, and even if claims 1, 5 and 6 are considered obvious and otherwise not patentable, claims 7 and 8 are believed more distinctly non-obvious and patentable.

Editorial errors in claim 6 regarding "functional" and "function" have been discovered and hence corrected.

In summary, it is believed that the present Amendment is totally responsive to the Office Action and hence that the application is now in condition for allowance.

It may be of interest to the Examiner that the undersigned attorney has been informed by the applicant that the Japanese patent application which is the basis of the claim of priority of this application came to be allowed after corresponding amendments were entered in its application.

Respectfully submitted,
Weaver Austin Villeneuve & Sampson LLP
/kn/

Keiichi Nishimura
Registration No. 29,093

July 23, 2008
500 12th Street, Suite 200
Oakland, California 94607
Telephone: (510) 663-1100
Telefax: (510) 663-0920